Complete Summary

GUIDELINE TITLE

Screening and management of bacterial vaginosis in pregnancy.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Yudin MH, Money DM, Infectious Diseases Committee. Screening and management of bacterial vaginosis in pregnancy. J Obstet Gynaecol Can 2008 Aug; 30(8):702-8. [57 references] PubMed

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

COMPLETE SUMMARY CONTENT

SCOPE

DISCLAIMER

METHODOLOGY - including Rating Scheme and Cost Analysis
RECOMMENDATIONS
EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS
BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS
QUALIFYING STATEMENTS
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE
INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT
CATEGORIES
IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY

SCOPE

DISEASE/CONDITION(S)

Bacterial vaginosis in pregnancy

GUIDELINE CATEGORY

Diagnosis
Evaluation
Management
Risk Assessment
Screening
Treatment

CLINICAL SPECIALTY

Family Practice Infectious Diseases Internal Medicine Obstetrics and Gynecology

INTENDED USERS

Physicians

GUIDELINE OBJECTIVE(S)

To review the evidence and provide recommendations on screening for and management of bacterial vaginosis in pregnancy

TARGET POPULATION

Pregnant women with vaginal discharge and malodour

INTERVENTIONS AND PRACTICES CONSIDERED

Screening/Diagnosis/Risk Assessment

- 1. Assessment of signs and symptoms
- 2. Gram stain of vaginal fluid
- 3. Risk assessment

Management/Treatment

- 1. Metronidazole or clindamycin regimen
- 2. Repeat testing one month after treatment

Note: Topical agents are not recommended for treatment of bacterial vaginosis.

MAJOR OUTCOMES CONSIDERED

- Antibiotic treatment efficacy/cure rates
- Influence of the treatment of bacterial vaginosis on the rates of adverse pregnancy outcomes such as preterm labour and delivery and preterm premature rupture of membranes

METHODOLOGY

METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT EVIDENCE

Searches of Electronic Databases

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT THE EVIDENCE

Medline, EMBASE, CINAHL, and Cochrane databases were searched for articles, published in English before the end of June 2007 on the topic of bacterial vaginosis in pregnancy.

NUMBER OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS

Not stated

METHODS USED TO ASSESS THE QUALITY AND STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Weighting According to a Rating Scheme (Scheme Given)

RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Quality of Evidence Assessment*

- I: Evidence obtained from at least one properly randomized controlled trial
- **II-1**: Evidence from well-designed controlled trials without randomization
- **II-2**: Evidence from well-designed cohort (prospective or retrospective) or case-control studies, preferably from more than one centre or research group
- **II-3**: Evidence obtained from comparisons between times or places with or without the intervention. Dramatic results in uncontrolled experiments (such as the results of treatment with penicillin in the 1940s) could also be included in this category
- **III**: Opinions of respected authorities, based on clinical experience, descriptive studies, or reports of expert committees

METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Review of Published Meta-Analyses Systematic Review

DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Not stated

METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Expert Consensus

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

^{*}Adapted from the Evaluation of Evidence criteria described in the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care.

RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Classification of Recommendations*

- **A**. There is good evidence to recommend the clinical preventive action.
- **B.** There is fair evidence to recommend the clinical preventive action.
- **C**. The existing evidence is conflicting and does not allow to make a recommendation for or against use of the clinical preventive action; however, other factors may influence decision-making.
- **D**. There is fair evidence to recommend against the clinical preventive action.
- **E**. There is good evidence to recommend against the clinical preventive action.
- **L**. There is insufficient evidence (in quantity or quality) to make a recommendation; however, other factors may influence decision-making.

COST ANALYSIS

A formal cost analysis was not performed and published cost analyses were not reviewed.

METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

Internal Peer Review

DESCRIPTION OF METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

This guideline has been prepared by the Infectious Diseases Committee and approved by the Executive and Council of the Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Canada (SOGC).

RECOMMENDATIONS

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Definitions of the levels of evidence (I, II-1, II-2, II-3, and III) and grades of recommendations (A-E and L) are provided at the end of the "Major Recommendations" field.

There is currently no consensus as to whether to screen for or treat bacterial vaginosis in the general pregnant population in order to prevent adverse outcomes, such as preterm birth.

^{*}Adapted from the Evaluation of Evidence criteria described in the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care.

- 1. In symptomatic pregnant women, testing for and treatment of bacterial vaginosis is recommended for symptom resolution. Diagnostic criteria are the same for pregnant and non-pregnant women. (**I-A**)
- 2. Treatment with either oral or vaginal antibiotics is acceptable for achieving a cure in pregnant women with symptomatic bacterial vaginosis who are at low risk of adverse obstetric outcomes. (**I-A**)
- 3. Asymptomatic women and women without identified risk factors for preterm birth should not undergo routine screening for or treatment of bacterial vaginosis. (**I-B**)
- 4. Women at increased risk for preterm birth may benefit from routine screening for and treatment of bacterial vaginosis. (**I-B**)
- 5. If treatment for the prevention of adverse pregnancy outcomes is undertaken, it should be with metronidazole 500 mg orally twice daily for seven days or clindamycin 300 mg orally twice daily for seven days. Topical (vaginal) therapy is not recommended for this indication. (**I-B**)
- 6. Testing should be repeated one month after treatment to ensure that cure was achieved. (**III-L**)

Definitions:

Quality of Evidence Assessment*

- I: Evidence obtained from at least one properly randomized controlled trial
- II-1: Evidence from well-designed controlled trials without randomization
- **II-2**: Evidence from well-designed cohort (prospective or retrospective) or case-control studies, preferably from more than one centre or research group
- **II-3**: Evidence obtained from comparisons between times or places with or without the intervention. Dramatic results in uncontrolled experiments (such as the results of treatment with penicillin in the 1940s) could also be included in this category
- **III**: Opinions of respected authorities, based on clinical experience, descriptive studies, or reports of expert committees

Classification of Recommendations**

- **A**. There is good evidence to recommend the clinical preventive action.
- **B.** There is fair evidence to recommend the clinical preventive action.
- **C**. The existing evidence is conflicting and does not allow to make a recommendation for or against use of the clinical preventive action; however, other factors may influence decision-making.
- **D**. There is fair evidence to recommend against the clinical preventive action.
- **E**. There is good evidence to recommend against the clinical preventive action.

- **L**. There is insufficient evidence (in quantity or quality) to make a recommendation; however, other factors may influence decision-making.
- *The quality of evidence reported in these guidelines has been adapted from The Evaluation of Evidence criteria described in the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care.
- **Recommendations included in these guidelines have been adapted from the Classification of Recommendations criteria described in the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care.

CLINICAL ALGORITHM(S)

None provided

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

TYPE OF EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The type of supporting evidence is identified and graded for each recommendation (see "Major Recommendations").

BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Guideline implementation will assist the practitioner in developing an approach to the diagnosis and treatment of bacterial vaginosis in pregnant women. Patients will benefit from appropriate management of this condition.

POTENTIAL HARMS

A small number of studies have indicated that treatment with metronidazole may increase preterm birth rates.

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

This guideline reflects emerging clinical and scientific advances as of the date issued and is subject to change. The information should not be construed as dictating an exclusive course of treatment or procedure to be followed. Local institutions can dictate amendments to these opinions. They should be well documented if modified at the local level.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE

DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

An implementation strategy was not provided.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT CATEGORIES

IOM CARE NEED

Getting Better

IOM DOMAIN

Effectiveness

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Yudin MH, Money DM, Infectious Diseases Committee. Screening and management of bacterial vaginosis in pregnancy. J Obstet Gynaecol Can 2008 Aug;30(8):702-8. [57 references] PubMed

ADAPTATION

Not applicable: The guideline was not adapted from another source.

DATE RELEASED

2008 Aug

GUIDELINE DEVELOPER(S)

Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada - Medical Specialty Society

SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING

Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada

GUIDELINE COMMITTEE

Infectious Diseases Committee

COMPOSITION OF GROUP THAT AUTHORED THE GUIDELINE

Principal Authors: Mark H. Yudin, MD; Deborah M. Money, MD

Committee Members: Marc Boucher, MD, Montreal QC; Beatrice Cormier, MD, Montreal QC; Andrée Gruslin, MD, Ottawa ON; Deborah M. Money, MD, Vancouver BC; Gina Ogilvie, MD, Vancouver BC; Caroline Paquet, RM, Trois-Rivières QC; Audrey Steenbeek, RN, Halifax NS; Nancy Van Eyk, MD, Halifax NS; Julie van Schalkwyk, MD, Vancouver BC; Thomas Wong, MD, Ottawa ON; Mark H. Yudin (Chair), MD, Toronto ON

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Disclosure statements have been received from all members of the committee.

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

GUIDELINE AVAILABILITY

Electronic copies: Available in Portable Document Format (PDF) from the <u>Society</u> of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada Web site.

Print copies: Available from the Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada, La société des obstétriciens et gynécologues du Canada (SOGC) 780 promenade Echo Drive Ottawa, ON K1S 5R7 (Canada); Phone: 1-800-561-2416

AVAILABILITY OF COMPANION DOCUMENTS

None available

PATIENT RESOURCES

None available

NGC STATUS

This NGC summary was completed by ECRI Institute on February 9, 2009. The information was verified by the guideline developer on March 4, 2009.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

This NGC summary is based on the original guideline, which is subject to the guideline developer's copyright restrictions.

DISCLAIMER

NGC DISCLAIMER

The National Guideline Clearinghouse™ (NGC) does not develop, produce, approve, or endorse the guidelines represented on this site.

All guidelines summarized by NGC and hosted on our site are produced under the auspices of medical specialty societies, relevant professional associations, public or private organizations, other government agencies, health care organizations or plans, and similar entities.

Guidelines represented on the NGC Web site are submitted by guideline developers, and are screened solely to determine that they meet the NGC

Inclusion Criteria which may be found at http://www.quideline.gov/about/inclusion.aspx.

NGC, AHRQ, and its contractor ECRI Institute make no warranties concerning the content or clinical efficacy or effectiveness of the clinical practice guidelines and related materials represented on this site. Moreover, the views and opinions of developers or authors of guidelines represented on this site do not necessarily state or reflect those of NGC, AHRQ, or its contractor ECRI Institute, and inclusion or hosting of guidelines in NGC may not be used for advertising or commercial endorsement purposes.

Readers with questions regarding guideline content are directed to contact the guideline developer.

© 1998-2009 National Guideline Clearinghouse

Date Modified: 4/6/2009

